

**Remarks**

This Application has been carefully reviewed in light of the final Office Action mailed April 28, 2004. Applicants appreciate the Examiner's consideration of the Application and respectfully request favorable action in this case.

**Rejections**

The Examiner rejected Claims 16–17, 42–43, 58–59, 64–65, 67–68, and 70–71 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,760,572 (*Tomikawa*). The Examiner rejected Claims 11, 24, 26, 37, and 69 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,593,282 (*Acampora*) in view of *Tomikawa*. The Examiner rejected Claims 12, 14, 18, 20, 38, 40, 44, 54, 56, 60, and 62 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Acampora* and *Tomikawa*, further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,553,000 B1 (*Ganesh*). The Examiner rejected Claims 15, 21, 41, 57, and 63 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Acampora* and *Tomikawa* in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,822,523 (*Rothschild*).

In support of these rejections, the Examiner contends that *Tomikawa* discloses destination codes as claimed in this Application. (Office Action dated April 28, 2004 at 2, 4–5). *Tomikawa* describes a multicast communication method that involves sending a prior notice to all stations. In the frame for transmitting the prior notice, the S field is “1” and the DS field is all “0” as shown in Figure 9A. (Col. 10, ll. 25–29). The information field I includes a “text identifier” (which will be used to identify the impending limited multicast message), and “the remaining field thereof is used for designating addresses of a plurality of destination addresses of destination stations for receiving the notice.” (Col. 10, ll. 30–36). As indicated in Figure 9A, this field is a string of station addresses. In the example described in *Tomikawa*, the stations addresses 3a, 3b, and 3d of stations 3a, 3b, and 3d are written in information field I. (Col. 10, ll. 50–52). All the stations (other than the one sending the notice) receive the notice message and check whether their intra-addresses are written in the station address string following the text identifier of information field I. (Col. 10, ll. 56–59; S46 of Figure 11). Those stations that find their addresses included in the address string determine that the frame is prior notice of a multicast communication destined for themselves, and they hold the text identifier and transmit an acknowledgement response. (Col. 11., ll. 3–16; S48 and S50 in Figure 11). Those stations that do not detect their addresses in the address string determine the frame is not a prior notice for a multicast communication destined for

themselves, and they release the message. (Col. 11, ll. 16–24). The sender can then use the frame shown in Figure 9B with the previously noticed text identifier to send a limited multicast message to the destination stations, and the destination stations receive the messages by detecting the previously noticed text identifier as shown in Figure 8B. (Col. 11, ll. 25–44).

Contrary to the Examiner's characterization, *Tomikawa* does not disclose, teach, or suggest a “destination code having values for a plurality of positions, each position corresponding to a particular receiver,” as recited in independent Claims 11, 26, 37, 67, 68, 69, 70, and 71. Although the Examiner identifies the information field in *Tomikawa* as the destination code, the Examiner's identification ignores the distinction between the claim terms “positions” and “values.” The information field of *Tomikawa* does not include “values for a plurality of positions, each position corresponding to a particular receiver.” While the station addresses found in the information field correspond to particular destination stations, it is the particular values of the station addresses—not the positions of the station addresses in the information field—that correspond to the particular destination addresses. Because the positions do not correspond to particular receivers in *Tomikawa*, the positions of the station addresses in the information field can be changed without having any effect on the communication.

The Examiner incorrectly contends that “the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., the bit positions corresponding to a particular receiver) are not recited in the rejected claims.” (Office Action dated April 18, 2004 at 7). Contrary to the Examiner's contention, independent Claims 11, 26, 37, 67, 68, 69, 70, and 71 recite a “destination code having values for a plurality of positions, each position corresponding to a particular receiver.” (emphasis added). Whether the claimed positions are referred to as “bit” positions is inconsequential.

For at least this reason, none of the references cited by the Examiner discloses, teaches, or suggests the “destination code having values for a plurality of positions, each position corresponding to a particular receiver,” as recited in independent Claims 11, 26, 37, 67, 68, 69, 70, and 71. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of independent Claims 11, 26, 37, 67, 68, 69, 70, and 71, as well as all claims that depend from these independent claims.


Conclusion

Applicants have made an earnest attempt to place this Application in condition for allowance. For at least the foregoing reasons, and for other reasons clearly apparent, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and full allowance of all pending claims.

If the Examiner feels that a telephone conference would advance prosecution of this Application in any manner, the Examiner is invited to contact Jeffery D. Baxter, Attorney for Applicants, at the Examiner's convenience at (214) 953-6791.

Although Applicants believe no fees are due, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fee or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-0384 of Baker Botts L.L.P.

Respectfully submitted,  
BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.  
Attorneys for Applicants



Jeffery D. Baxter  
Reg. No. 45,560

Date: June 28, 2004

CORRESPONDENCE ADDRESS:

Customer Number

**05073**